DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 392 CG 013 814

AUTHOR	Lowy, Louis; And Others
TITLE	Managing Management Training Programs in Gerontology.
INSTITUTION	Boston Univ., Mass. School of Social Work.; Brandeis Univ., Waltham, Mass. Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare.
SPONS AGENCY	Administration on Aging (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	16 Nov 78
GRANT	A-41-90-A-1410(01)
NOTE	14p.; Paper presented at the Conference of the Gerontological Society (30th, San Francisco, California, November, 1978)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Gerontology; *Educational Programs; *Field Experience Programs; Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Management Education; *Professional Training; Training Techniques

ABSTRACT

A graduate-level management training program in gerontology is presented through a description of a consortium of two universities (Boston University and Brandeis University) and consisting of three types of training (gerontology and aging, sociology and social work, and management techniques). The areas of interest described in these materials include the following: (1) program philosophy, (2) student selection, (3) site selection for training practica, (4) field experiences, (5) advising problems, and (6) faculty participation. (HLM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED177392

"MANAGING MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS IN GERONTOLOGY"

Participants:

Louis Lowy, Ph.D. (Boston University School of Social Work and Boston University Gerontology Center, Boston, MA 02215.)

Harold J. Bejcek, M.S.W., M.P.H. (Boston University School of Social Work and Boston University Gerontology Center, Boston, MA 02215.)

Phyllis H. Mutschler, M.S.S.S. (Boston University School of Social Work and Boston University Gerontology Center, Boston, MA 02215.)

Sandra Kretz, M.A. (Brandeis University, Waltham, MA 02154.)

Paper presented at the 31st Annual Scientific Meeting of the Gerontological Society, November 16-20, 1978, Dallas, Texas.

The Brandeis University-Boston University Consortium Training Program for Management in Gerontology is a Title IV A Training Program supported by AoA Grant #A-41-90-A-1410 (01).

G013814

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Louis Lowy, And Others

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ERIC

Louis Lowy: The theme tonight is "Managing Management Training Programs." There are two aspects I would like to mention right in the beginning: one is concerned with a Management Training Program in Gerontology on a graduate level, and the other is concerned with a consortium model of two universities which have engaged in this joint effort, Boston University and Brandeis University. The Administration on Aging, AoA, has funded this program over the last three years.

The program we are going to discuss tonight is the program of a consortium of two universities consisting of three types of training programs. At Boston University, the training program involves the Gerontology Center of the university as a non-academic unit and two graduate schools, the Graduate School of Social Work, with its substantive concentration in the field of aging, and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, with its department of sociology, primarily the branch of Community Sociology. The other part of our consortium is Brandeis University, specifically the Florence Heller School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, the Program in Economics and Politics of Aging. The principal investigator, in this case myself, is suspended in the middle.

The participants in each of these programs are the students and the faculty teaching courses in both schools. Then there are field instructors or practicum instructors, in the School of Social Work, and in the Sociology Department; and then there are the agencies where the training program is carried out. In Social Work the Master's level program is oriented towards training Middle Management Personnel. In the Sociology Department and at Brandeis there are Doctoral Programs training people for Senior Management positions. We have not only different universities involved, but also different levels of training. In 1974 Brandeis was in the process of reorganizing the Economics and Politics of Aging program and the Boston University School of Social Work had developed in 1974 a concentration in Aging at the Master's level. Both institutions recognized that each one had a particular contribution to make, and there was no need to duplicate the offerings.

Sandra Kretz: A great deal of what we will talk about tonight is putting together the nuts and bolts of a management consortium which we hope will be instructive to those who would like to benefit from that experience. But, in just a few moments, I would like to speak about the philosophy of the program. It is very simply stated, that the consortium is focused to train persons at a variety of levels to work with direct service programs and policy relating to non-institutionalized elderly persons. I think you will note in all of our presentations this evening a real emphasis on community based programs and problems, which is a very different focus from many of the academic programs of training professionals for careers in long term care. This reflects a reliance on resources available at both universities. That is, I think we do and train for what we are already good at. But I think the fact that those resources exist results from a long standing concern for a term I use reluctantly, and that is "alternatives to institutionalization." I would rather view this type of program as creating professionals in key areas so that the institutionalization only occurs when community based living arrangements are not available. Those of you who are familiar with the writings of the primary architects of the program, Louis Lowy at Boston University and Bob Binstock and Jim Schulz at Brandeis, will find many of their personal philosophical concepts operationalized in the program. And so we believe that this program presents a unique training component in the broad spectrum of many kinds of gerontology training programs available throughout the country today.

Louis Lowy: Thus, we really were concerned with community aged and we were concerned about developing, you might say, man and woman power for particular managerial positions of the mid-level as well as of the more advanced level. Now, we will first briefly present the program and then we will have an opportunity for you to ask all the questions you want. Hopefully, we will have some of the answers. Members in the audience who want to respond might give their views. Perhaps we can talk briefly about the Master's Degree program in Social Work at Boston University first and then the Doctoral Program in Community Sociology at Boston University.

Phyllis Mutschler: I'm going to talk about student selection. Students must first matriculate into one of the programs administering or affiliated with the program. They will have taken Miller's Analogies or Graduate Record Exams and submitted a record of past academic and vocation experience as well as a statement of future aspirations and career objectives. All of these are taken into account as students identify themselves as potential participants in the program during their first year in graduate school.

During the orientation process, first year students are invited to attend both a non-credit Introduction to Gerontology course and a series of seminars on management. Attendance at seminars, while not required, usually serves to indicate serious intent to pursue administration/management as a career option. In addition, students call or visit the field instructors to discuss the nature of the program or to explore their own fitness for it.

Students are told that they may be part of the program without receiving any funding. In fact, we have found it desirable to separate funding from the decision-making process in order to examine the student's participation in the program on its own merits. So far, there has been a total of 33 students in the program - and their age range is from 22 years to 52 years with an average age of 28.9 years. We've only had one member of a minority group, although we've really tried hard to recruit minority students for the program. (That's true for the direct service component of the aging concentration, as well.) Most of the students in the management training program have had prior experience in direct service with the elderly while some few held planning positions.

Louis Lowy: Now let's talk about the Site Selection, where the student is in fact being trained.

Harold Bejcek: A very important element of the Master's program is the field experience. We're particularly fortunate, I think, in the Boston area because the Aging Network is composed of the Federal Level, State Level, Local Level

Voluntary Level. In Boston we have the Region I Federal Office and we have had Field Placements there. We have the Department of Elder Affairs, which is the State Office, and we have Field Placements there. We have a variety and an array of local agencies in the form of Home Care Corporations and of course we have an array of voluntary agencies working with the elderly as well. So we deliberately try to get placements in each of those categories and have been successful in so doing. I feel that the student should have an opportunity to see how the agenices interdigitate in the delivery of services, from planning.

Looking at the agencies, we try to find those that have an acceptance of and a clear concept of an agency's responsibility for professional education and training. We look for those which have an availability of professionally qualified site supervisors and a willingness to involve the students at the operation at various levels. It must also be an organized and smoothly functioning agency. Judging those things is sometimes rather difficult and getting them all present at the optimum level is sometimes rather difficult also.

Frequently an agency will call asking if we could place a student with them. That's the first opening. We ask them to write us a letter stating what they have in mind, what their program is, and what they would be able to offer. Phyllis and I will sit down with the executive or designated staff to review what they have in mind, review what we see as our student's needs and what the University would require. Then we come back and talk to our field placement department. Of course, the School of Social Work has been in operation for a long time. The School has relationships with many agencies so we don't have to do a great deal of recruiting of field sites. Frequently we go back to those where we've had good placements.

Louis Lowy: Now, it's one thing to have the students and another thing to have the site. The question is how to match them.

Phyllis Mutschler: A listing of available agencies, along with their respective "task assignments" and responsibilities for students, is compiled through the site selection and review process.

In order to arrive at an appropriate assignment of students to the various training sites, the field instructors interview each prospective candidate for the program to ascertain his/her past experience, present interests and future career goals. By reviewing these aspects with each student, a determination is made about the nature and range of assignments which will add depth and breadth to the student's repetoire of skills. We jointly consider the type of agency setting (private vs public, federal, state and local) which will allow a student to test out his/her interest in a particular aspect of management/administration. For instance, a student who has never worked on the state level may want to work at the state Office of Aging. Someone who is going to go back into a rural area may be more appropriately placed in an Area Agency on Aging, which has assignments more easily replicated in another area of the country.

The emphasis in these pre-assignment conferences is on the assessment of the student's educational needs. In addition, however, consideration is given to such practical matters as transportation and personality of student and proposed site supervisor.

Once a decision has been reached, one of the field instructors calls the agency or agencies to alert the site supervisor or agency contact person (usually the Director or Assistant Director) to expect a call from the student who will be making an appointment to visit the agency. This agency visit gives the site supervisor and the student a chance to size one another up. In the rare instance where the agency or student decides the assignment does not meet expectations, the student and field instructors re-evaluate other potential training sites.

Louis Lowy: As in any marriage, you never know how it turns out in advance until you live together. That's the same as with the student and an agency. How do you match them in the best possible way and what do you do when the match is not working out. First let us look at the faculty-based field instruction component of the Master's Degree and the Doctoral Program at Boston University.

Phyllis Mutschler: It is interesting to reflect on how much our particular model of field instruction is reminiscent of the early days of training in Social Work where the neophyte worker received his or her test of fitness for the profession "in the field." In many respects, our students are assigned as apprentices to Site Supervisors who are mostly Directors or Assistant Directors of agencies serving the aged. It them falls to us, as the faculty based field instructors to provide the bridging mechanisms back to the School of Social Work curriculum. As is true of other models which use faculty based Field Instructors, there is some tension between our roles and that of the Site Supervisors. We need to be vigilant in seeing to it that we neither usurp nor duplicate the administrative supervision role that is assigned to the Supervisor at the site.

We do look for agencies which are willing to give our students an opportunity to learn various skills and provide them with some degree of supervision and instruction in the field. However, we don't require that students receive the traditional two hours of supervision per week.

As "Educational Supervisors," the field instructors play a variety of roles. In negotiating a "work contract" to assure some breadth and depth of exposure, they are the student's advocate. As seminar leaders, and consultants on various aspects of student's assignments they serve as educators and role models. Along with other advisors at the School of Social Work, they are expected to help the students integrate what they learn at their field placements with concepts learned in the classroom. Because of the nature of this program, they have many opportunities to help students reflect upon and analyze the various components of their educational experience. In addition, as advisors, they have routine evaluation and registration responsibilities which make them administrators for the students. The Boston University Doctoral Program in Community Sociology also has a field experience component in which the advisors serve many of the same functions as the faculty based field instructors for the School of Social Work. These internships are monitored less frequently because of the differences in program requirements.

Advising Problems

While the agencies used for field placement sites do have a commitment to training students, many of them are unfamiliar with the place of and requirements for field work within the Social Work curriculum. Many Site Supervisors are not social workers but businessmen and urban planners. Some have background in Russian or art history, political science, sociology or the ministry.

Several problems may arise as a result of the discrepancies between Site Supervisors' and School of Social Work's expectations. Insufficient time may be allotted for supervision of students on site or there may be reluctance to release a student from "work" to attend professional seminars or other meetings which are relevant to their education experience. Similarly, meetings, projects or other experiences which may be desirable for the student's acquisition of knowledge or skills, may be considered "off limits" for trainees. All of these difficulties stem from a misunderstanding about the nature of the student role as "learner in the profession." Site Supervisors may view the student as another pair of hands - a resource for the agency. While the student does serve the agency's needs both by work produced as well as by knowledge infused, his/her primary responsibility is to be a learner. Thus, the faculty based field instructor needs to insure that the student's "contract" allows sufficient 1) breadth of experience within a management framework, 2) independent action, and 3) supervision, so a student may develop competencies in several aspects of administration.

Occasionally, particularly when there has been some turnover in personnel, the student may have difficulty clarifying the exact nature and scope of his assignment. Many small tasks or parts of a project may be completed before the student realizes that his internship lacks a consistent focus. Again, it falls to the advisor to redirect the agency's planning for the student's education/training.

Louis Lowy: Here is a list which describes the courses that our students take. Students are expected to take a course in "Social Work Practice in the Community" as a prerequisite, and then Basic Administration, to be followed by Advanced Application of Administration, Community Planning, and Advanced Community Planning. Harold will want to talk about the integrative mechanism to bring together these components.

Harold Bejcek: Let me take a couple of seconds on the very important element of the field placement objectives and lead into the integrative part of it and how that is achieved. First, the students achieve some operational understanding of the whole aging management/administration network. How does this all function at the federal, state and local level? As we all know, there are certain eternal verities throughout, regardless of the size of the system. At the least, we hope students will have some grasp of what goes into putting agencies together, putting the whole system together and holding it together. We ask that they have an opportunity to work independently to show they can start out on a task and complete it. We ask that they have an opportunity to work as part of a team, to observe and study overall agency operation, to observe and study interplay of agencies in the whole mechanism. Nothing really stands alone. So, how do they all mesh to get some appropriate delivery of service? Out of this the students should have a comprehensive knowledge of how at least one agency in the whole network functions. Each student should be the best informed on the level of agency at which placed. They then come back to the group and share, thus having peer teaching involved in our programs.

How does this function, and how does the field placement operate? Bear in mind that Phyllis and I have already had a visit with the agency and have talked to the students on the campus. A few weeks after the fall starts we go out to ~~the sites, sit down with the student~~ and the Site Supervisor and jointly determine what is being planned in order to address themselves to the following four points: 1) operational understanding of the aging administration/management network; 2) operational understanding of the application of administration/management fundamentals; 3) opportunity to work independently; work as part of a team; observe and study overall agency operation and observe and study interplay of agencies in network; 4) attain a comprehensive knowledge of the agency. Towards the end of the term we make a site visit to review progress. A few weeks after the start of the second term we make a site visit to up-date its plan and at the end of the term review results.

Initially we ask the Site Supervisor and the student to develop what we call a contract agreement of the things they will be working on, and a time-table. This sets out bench marks for us to measure progress.

In the area of administration/management, we have an array of some one hundred and nineteen tasks. You can't cover all of those, obviously, but they begin to create a focus for the student, to concentrate on the things they need the most. Now, that's the field placement.

Another element in the training program is the professional seminars. The objectives are to supplement the academic and the field experience. You're not going to get everything in the field or in class. We want to help fill the gaps. We want to try to integrate the academic and they field material. How do the two come together? How do they support and mesh? We want the students to have the opportunity to analyze, prepare, present and lead a discussion. After all, what are you going to have to do as an administrator and on many occasions as a staff person? You must bring something to the staff or lay it out to the board or committee. We want students to have the opportunity to develop that skill through the seminars.

Another objective of the seminars is to assess and understand the operational roles of agencies, which takes us back to the first premise, to try to get an understanding of federal, state, local and voluntary functioning. Where do they fit in? In the seminars we try to get some understanding of that. All of this is geared towards developing some administration or management skills. Here, also, is the exchange of information which is another function and objective of the professional seminars.

The content of a seminar comes in two different groupings. The didactic presentations, and to determine what we're going to have in these, we have a poll. We have a rating sheet which students rate items on a 0-5 scale. Those items are: organization management, financial management, evaluation of program and administration, legal and insurance issues, community resources, planning program development, fund raising directed into grants, contracts and third party payments, public relations, and others. From this tabulation we set out schedule for the year. We have one two-hour didactic seminar each month. Phyllis or I lead the seminar or get some outside person to lead the discussion and make a presentation. We try to keep away from that which is covered in class or what they might be getting in the field. We try to fill the gaps.

When the students lead their seminars they are asked to take some item that they are working on, or an issue from the field-experience and analyze it, prepare it to present and lead a discussion. We serve as consultants in this process. The third kind of seminar is a joint one with the Brandeis component. There are formal presentations and a formal discussion with faculty and students. We had two joint seminars last year.

What happens to the student in all of this? At the end of each term the Site Supervisor has to give us a written evaluation in which we suggest that they comment on the following points; demonstrated initiative, judgement, organizing of tasks, organizing of their time and effort, interpersonal skills, the community relations and also to give us some description of the projects that were undertaken and achievements.

We get those at the end of the first term and at the end of the second term. Phyllis and I have to write an evaluation at the conclusion. We take into consideration the students' academic work, their field work, as well as their participation in the professional seminars.

Another element in the integrative process would be the continuing relationships with our graduates. One facet of our responsibilities is to assist in ways we can with job finding by assessing job opportunities. Students who have graduated still come back or call and often we have individual consultation with them. We have, in each of the last few years, made a survey of all prior graduates in the Gerontology Program to determine what they are doing, how they feel the program has been important to them and where it could be strengthened to make them more effective in the field. I think it's worth a moment to point out that of our graduates, we have one in a Federal governmental agency - a Veterans' Administration Hospital, working with the aging; in the State - we have one person in the state Department of Mental Health. In Aging we have four who are at Regional and Municipal jobs, Triple A's or Home Care Corporations. In the private sector we have one individual in a proprietary agency with aging. We have four in nonprofit aging agencies and two working in other nonprofit human service agencies. On the whole, the contribution of the program to the field of Aging Administration and Management by the Boston University program has been a very substantial one.

<u>Louis Lowy</u>: Let's now turn to the Brandeis portion of the Consortium and examine its complementarity with the Boston University program.

<u>Sandra Kretz</u>: The Doctoral Program, located at the Heller School, brings to the Consortium resources with another dimension. This is a multi-disciplinary program focusing on the economics and politics of aging and seeking to train academicians, researchers, senior managers and policy analysts in a variety of Aging related areas. Unlike the Boston University component of the Consortium which focuses on mid-level managers and a kind of a hands-on experience through field training, the Brandeis program emphasizes a more academic sequence in the development of skills and policy analysis, program implementation, and social research. The direction and objectives are different but, we feel, complementary. The program encompasses several spheres of inquiry including faculty research, academic course work offered to students and also available to other students in the Boston Area through a cross-registration arrangement, student research and community service involvement by faculty, researchers and students. It's the educational component of the program I'll be discussing in some detail, but I don't want to minimize the very significant faculty research that's going on at the Heller School in the area of politics of aging,

retirement and pension policy, income maintenance and economic role of women in the middle or later years. All of these are on-going functions in the Heller School network, and are additional resources for the educational program. There are two sets of handouts about the Brandeis component of the program which are available afterwards, so I will just talk very briefly about the program in two sections. One part of the discussion is structure and a sort of a nuts and bolts description, and second, a discussion of the program in relation to the multidisciplinary nature of the Heller School. A little later in the program I'll be talking about the B.U.-Brandeis Consortium relationship and the relationships that the Consortium and University have together.

There are some basic descriptors of the program structure. One is that the student contingent is quite small in comparison to the B.U. component of the Consortium. The students receiving training grants number about six or seven each year. In addition to that, there are a number of students who are not on training grants but who are considered associates of the program. They can elect to go through the sequence of the program even though their stipends may come from different sources or they might be self-supported. There are currently 22 students who are associated with the program including those on a training grant. Five of these have not been in residence with Heller School over the past year. They were either out collecting data for their dissertation or taking the year out for paid employment. Second, students have been about age 30 with about 5 to 10 years of programatic or teaching experience beyond a Master's Degree before coming to the Heller School. Our range of ages has also been quite large. We've had students from mid-twenties to the age of sixty-two in the Doctoral Program, although most of the ages do cluster around the age of 30. The depth of previous experience means that there is not a need for a field training and students are expected to focus on their academic work in relation to their background, and begin to develop an individualized program we'll be talking about later.

Third, the students' previous academic degrees contain a preponderance of degrees in Social Work, although previous academic degrees also range to economics, political science, public administration, public health and sociology. Students can enter the program in two ways, either by having previous gerontological program experience, and wanting to build more of a policy focus in the politics and economics of aging, or through a desiring to apply a specific discipline background such as economics to gerontology. The students who come into the gerontology program usually have about five to ten years previous experience, but not all come to the program with gerontology experience.

The program has had two graduates so far who have already gone on to academic careers and several more are expected to graduate in June, and then there will be a fairly consistent output of graduates. Obviously, it takes longer to get through the doctoral program than the two year Master's program, so the output has not been as great.

One of the handouts describes the academic or educational program in some detail. So I want to quickly talk about the core program, which consists of two basic courses, the economics of aging and the politics and policy processes of aging. In addition to these two courses each student on a training grant is required to take at least three courses in either a politics sequence or an economics sequence, to give a total of five required courses in the politics or economics of aging. This is within the total 12 course requirement at the Heller School, eighteen for a student with a B.A.-these latter are very, very rare. The Heller program for all students requires a three semester social research sequence as well as a two semester policy analysis course for a total of five required courses. Because there are five aging courses and five general Heller courses this means that students in the Aging Program fulfill ten of the twelve total course requirements by participating in the program. The reality of all this is that most students take more than the required basic twelve courses because they want to take a number of electives beyond the five required aging courses and five required social research and public policy courses.

The Brandeis program emphasizes the construction of individualized fields of inquiry for each student. Because students come into the program with a number of years of experience beforehand, they are expected to begin developing papers and research projects in their chosen area of inquiry, whether it be retirement, or the politics of aging, or political attitudes, etc. This gives a consistent theme through the program in a specific area of interest.

Students in the Heller program are also required to write what is called a substantive paper. A substantive paper is a requirement I don't believe exists anywhere else. It is a predissertation qualifying paper instead of comprehensive exams, which must be approved by a faculty committee. As a general rule they tend to be about 75-100 pages, and a literature review as opposed to specific research topics like the dissertation. The dissertation utilizes a political or economic analytic approach applied to an aging topic. Dissertation topics have tended to demonstrate a wide scope of inquiry, and some examples include: political attitudes and behavior of aged Chicanos, computer modeling of women's Social Security benefits and work patterns, factors affecting early retirement decisions, private pension programs for women, and Medicare policy and health care for rural elderly. There is a very wide scope of interest.

The Heller program focuses on areas of special expertise of the three primary faculty persons who are the architects of the program, Bob Binstock and Rob Hudson who are political scientists and Jim Schulz who is an economist. Very briefly, I would like to talk now about three additional areas of resources at the Heller School available to students in the program. The first of these are the multi-disciplinary course offerings at the Heller School, which are not limited to the field of gerontology. I have a number of brochures of blue and yellow over there which describe the total Heller program. (Available from the Registrar, Heller Graduate School, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA 02154.) So let me say here that the Heller School was designed as a multi-disciplinary center which provides a unique backup for programs such as ours. The faculty consists of sociologists, economists, political scientists, social workers, social psychiatrists, social planners, persons trained in public health, law, and public management who are available to lend their expertise through course work, research and their presence in doctoral dissertation work. In addition to the gerontology program, the school has training programs in mental health, mental retardation and developmental disabilities, alchoholism, social planning, health care and family policy, which allows students to construct unique programs of research interest. A student interested in, for instance, the elderly mentally retarded would have a backup not only from the disciplines or the aging faculty, but from a sociologist

ERIC

and a lawyer, who are the principal mental retardation faculty persons. This really gives a singular resource for the students.

The second, and very unique, resource available at the school is a newly created Health Policy Consortium which is separate from the B.U.-Brandeis Consortium we have been talking about. The Health Policy Consortium is comprised of the Heller School at Brandeis, the Boston University Medical School and the political science department of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. This Health Policy Consortium has a variety of research projects ongoing which provide opportunities for research and employment for doctoral students.

The third resource is a master's degree program also offered at the Heller School, graduating its first class in 1978 in Human Services Management. This is a much more technical type of master's degree than is offered at Boston University. There is a variety of course work available in such things as program management, budgeting, and computer and communications systems. Doctoral students who feel that they don't have those kinds of skills can take advantage of courses offered in the Master's program.

Louis Lowy: When discussing the Consortium Model we want to describe how the two universities relate to one another. Let us talk with Phyllis.

Phyllis Mutschler: Boston University can offer Brandeis a group of University wide resources through the Gerontology Center. There are a number of courses in Gerontology throughout the University, at the graduate (and undergraduate) level in almost all of the schools, but particularly in Sociology and Psychology. Thus, our interests at Boston University really complement the "Economics and Politics of Aging" at Brandeis.

Brandeis students can cross-register, and take courses at Boston University just as our students can at Brandeis. In addition to the course offerings, which are being expanded, particularly in the humanities, there are the faculty of the various schools who serve both our students and the Brandeis students as advisors, mentors and consultants. Boston University faculty also can serve as members of Brandeis dissertation committees.

In addition, we have had a number of doctoral candidates from Brandeis who have come to the School of Social Work, over the years, to serve as advisors, to teach research courses, to be advisors for independent study. In this way Boston University provides some Brandeis doctoral candidates with part-time employment.

Louis Lowy: So there are actually four parts: the faculty, the courses, the integrative seminars and the opportunity for faculty to teach in either program, to act as thesis or dissertation advisor and even to engage in research in the project. While we are about to conclude our formal part let us talk about the pluses and minuses of this arrangement. Harold, let's hear briefly what are the pluses of the Consortium arrangements.

Harold Bojcok: The Consortium arrangement has demonstrated two Universities can work together implementing a professional training program while concurrently augmenting these programs through special joint activities. Thus, on both an individual and a collective level the students have been the beneficiaries of an enriched program. The students' placements in the federal, state, local, and voluntary agencies generate internal studies, planning and service activities which would not otherwise take place. The program has demonstrated that students at both the master's and the doctoral levels can handle management tasks and has also clearly demonstrated that clinical and managerial tasks can be integrated. A follow up each year on all students who have gone through the program has determined that they are making a contribution to effective delivery of service, progressive planning, and constructive meeting of community needs for the elderly.

The elements of professional seminars, field instruction, workshops and conferences provides some of the essential ingredients for developing a mature, competent practitioner who can go into the field and carry major responsibilities.

I think we've found that students have been good judges of their educational needs; they have actively participated in constructing meaningful learning opportunities at their individual placements. I think the non-credit professional seminars, which are a requirement, are an essential part of the integrative process of learning, and because of that, the seminars deserve careful planning and require thoughtful execution.

Louis Lowy: Let me just mention the negatives on the balance sheet. There are tension points and problems. Some of them are internal to each institution, and some are related to the Consortium per se. There are problems around structure and around time constraints. Students and faculty are very busy, especially in programs that are so tightly structured, and the busy schedules do not allow for the necessary flexibility. Another problem is geography. The campuses are about 15 miles apart. While Boston University is located on the Mass Transit System, Brandeis is in the suburbs and is practically inaccessible by public transportation. This has created some logistical problems. Individual program requirements vary, and, as you know, academic institutions are as bureaucratic as agencies. There are set rules and there are set times for registration operating in a tightly scheduled environment in both institutions. Each institution is autonomous and autonomy makes it quite difficult to accomodate conflicting interests. That's why a consortium can only work well if mutual needs are met and the advantages outweigh the disadvantages and gets each "partner" something out of such an arrangement; that is, if enlightened self-interest is at work. Tension points have to be negotiated by the interested parties. This also creates strain. Master's degree and doctoral level programs represent differential status and power realities in the perception of students-faculty.

We have to recognize in any arrangement that social structures and needs change and what held true in 1975 does not hold true in 1978. We must use feedback mechanisms to adjust to changing conditions. As I said before, in any marriage, there are tensions. Some of them are inherent in the system; others may be more changeable. For example, we may be able to change the time sequences, although I don't know what we would do about mass transportation in Boston.

We have experimented with the use of video-tapes. Jim Schulz gave a lecture in economics and, as the students could not be out at Brandeis, we videotaped it and brought it to Boston University. It is important to arrange inter-faculty and inter-student meetings to get to know one another and to exchange ideas. Attendance at the Gerontological Society Meetings are important, because it gives both faculty and students from both universities an opportunity to meet and to get to know one another, and also to get to meet some of the people that they know or read about.

How does all this add up on balance? The balance sheet is much more skewed towards the positive side of the ledger than toward the negative. We have avoided unnecessary duplication of resources, particularly as these are very rare and costly. Brandeis did not have to design a clinical program and Boston University did not have to develop a program in politics or economics.

The Consortium has served as a focal point for funding. In a time of shrinking resources it is better to move and harness scarce means. People have gotten to know the Consortium and the Gerontology Center which derived a good deal of its initial prestige and status, especially in the difficult takeoff phase, through the Consortium.

Last and not least, we have created a training program that has produced administrators who are out there doing something worthwhile and quite effective. Eventhough the record is incomplete, we have indications that many graduates are doing well. They persevered in the field of aging, and are employed in a lot of important jobs. Many are providing leadership in gerontology. It's interesting that some people have chosen small communities rather than urban areas or rural areas, and I hope that some of them will make an impact there because, as you know, most graduates tend to flock to the urban areas. The very existence of this program provides support as many times graduates who are living in the area come by to nurture themselves again to make use of resources and consultation and gain new strength for future endeavors.